



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,889	06/26/2003	Cathy Klech Gelotte	MCP 275 CON 1	7232
27777	7590	03/09/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003			JAGOE, DONNA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/607,889	Applicant(s) GELOTTE ET AL.	
	Examiner Donna Jagoe	Art Unit 1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/21/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Claims 18-36 are presented for examination.

Specification

The specification is objected to because of the following informalities: there appears to be an error on page 4, line 12 of the instant specification wherein U.S. Patent No. 5,375,659 is recited. The patent is drawn to subject matter that is not germane to the instant case. It appears to be a typographical error. Page 4, line 20 discloses U.S. Patent No. 5,374,659. This appears to be the correct patent number. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 18-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sunshine et al. U.S. Patent No. B1 4,552,899.

Claims 18-36 are drawn to a composition comprising pharmacologically effective amounts of an amine and a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID), suspended in a liquid medium wherein the suspension comprises at least one suspending agent and taste masking agent and wherein the composition provides an enhanced absorption rate of the amine into the blood of a human compared with a corresponding composition comprising the amine but not the NSAID. Dependent claims are drawn to suspending agents and to dosages of ibuprofen/pseudoephedrine. Claims 26-28 and 34-36 are drawn to the enhanced absorption rate indicated by AUC and CMAX.

Sunshine et al. combines NSAID's such as ibuprofen in doses of from 50 to 400mg or in general, propionic acid derivatives in doses of from 25 mg to about 600 mg (column 4, lines 27) with pseudoephedrine (column 6, lines 61-67) for use as a preserved syrup formulation (column 12-13, lines 50-9). See also claims 21-23, 25, 26, 28 and especially claim 36. The composition is administered in admixture with suitable

Art Unit: 1614

pharmaceutical diluents, excipients or carriers suitably selected with respect to the intended form of administration, i.e., oral tablets, capsules, elixirs, syrups, etc. (column 5, line 50 to column 6, line 61).

It does not specifically recite a suspension. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a suspension base motivated by the well-known teaching that ibuprofen is not soluble in water, and as such, the ibuprofen would necessarily be suspended in the syrup aforementioned.

Sunshine et al. teach ibuprofen doses ranging from 25 mg to 600 mg. Instant claims 25 and 33 recite ibuprofen in an amount from 40mg to 800mg. As anyone of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate, preferred dosages are merely exemplary and serve as useful guideposts for the physician. There are, however, many reasons for varying dosages, including by orders of magnitude; for instance, treatment of an adult vs. treatment of a child, or a patient having an unusually severe pain would require a correspondingly higher dosage of ibuprofen. Furthermore, it is routine during animal and clinical studies to dramatically vary dosage to obtain data on parameters such as toxicity. For these and other self-evident reasons, it would have been obvious to have used higher dosages of ibuprofen. The specific safe and effective amount will be vary, with such factors as the particular condition being treated, the physical condition of the patient, the duration of treatment, the nature of the concurrent therapy (if any), the specific dosage form to be used, the carrier employed, the solubility of the formula therein and the **dosage regimen** desired for the composition.

Regarding instant claims 26-28 and 34-36, it is well settled that the recitation of a new intended use for an old product does not make a claim to that old product patentable. See *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990) ("**The discovery of a new property** or use of a previously known composition, even when that property and use are unobvious from prior art, can not impart patentability to claims to the known composition."); *Titanium Metals Corp. of Am. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 782, 227 USPQ 773, 778 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (composition claim reciting a newly discovered property of an old alloy did not satisfy section 102 because the alloy itself was not new); *In re Pearson*, 494 F.2d 1399, 1403, 181 USPQ 641, 644 (CCPA 1974) (intended use of an old composition does not render composition claim patentable); *In re Zierden*, 411 F.2d 1325, 1328, 162 USPQ 102, 104 (CCPA 1969) ("mere statement of a new use for an otherwise old or obvious composition cannot render a claim to the composition patentable."); *In re Sinex*, 309 F.2d 488, 492, 135 USPQ 302, 305 (CCPA 1962) (statement of intended use in an apparatus claim failed to distinguish over the prior art apparatus); *In re Hack*, 245 F.2d 246, 248, 114 USPQ 161, 162 (CCPA 1957) ("the grant of a patent on a composition or a machine cannot be predicated on a new use of that machine or composition"); *In re Benner*, 174 F.2d 938, 942, 82 USPQ 49, 53 (CCPA 1949) ("no provision has been made in the patent statutes for granting a patent upon an old product based solely upon discovery of a new use for such product").

Art Unit: 1614


Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donna Jagoe whose telephone number is (571) 272-0576. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel can be reached on (571) 272-0584. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Donna Jagoe
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1614



MARIANNE C. SEIDEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600